

March 8, 2001

DISAPPROVING DEPARTMENT OF
LABOR RULE RELATING TO
ERGONOMICS

SPEECH OF

HON. TIM ROEMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 2001

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, the ergonomics issue is not new. It was first proposed by Secretary Elizabeth Dole under the Bush administration and has since been subjected to over a decade of intense scientific analysis. It did not surprise anyone last year, because we have had many hearings on the topic, received hours of testimony, gone through a lengthy public rulemaking process, and debated the matter extensively here on the floor of the House.

This joint resolution, on the other hand, has been launched with no public hearings, no committee markups, no committee reports, no committee study, and almost no debate. Forcing this resolution through is a backdoor attempt to undermine the legitimate public rulemaking process in a way that has never been done before.

Thousands of employers have successfully implemented ergonomics programs resulting in the significant reduction of ergonomic injuries and illnesses and the savings of millions of dollars. Companies as diverse as 3M, Ford Motor Co., Fieldcrest-Cannon, Red Wing Shoes, Perdue Farms, and the Fresno Bee have implemented ergonomics programs that not only substantially reduced injuries and illnesses, but produced significant productivity improvements as well.

The fact is that ergonomics works. The National Academy of Sciences has said so, hundreds of successful businesses have said so, and the American public has said so.

If there are problems with the existing ergonomics standard, then the appropriate way to address them is through rulemaking. Passage of a CRA resolution not only dooms the existing standard, but delays for years and perhaps indefinitely the development of any general ergonomics standard. This is not just bad for workers, it is bad for business, and it is bad government.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this resolution.

REPEAL OF EXECUTIVE ORDER
13166

HON. BOB STUMP

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 2001

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, on August 11, 2000, former President Clinton signed Executive Order 13166, "Improving Access to Services for Persons with Limited English Proficiency."

When signing Executive Order 13166, former President Clinton cited concerns that "language barriers are preventing the federal government and recipients of federal financial assistance from effectively serving a large

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

number of people in this country." His main concern was that those who do not speak English are not able to apply for and receive federal assistance.

Mr. Speaker, Executive Order 13166 requires all federal agencies to examine the services they provide, as well as identify any need for services to those with limited English proficiency (LEP). The Executive Order requires federal agencies to develop and implement a system to provide those services in any language that LEP individuals may speak.

Mr. Speaker, we are already beginning to witness the potential costs associated with the implementation of Executive Order 13166. On January 10, 2001, the Department of Justice released a plan to implement Executive Order 13166. This Departmental plan not only creates new services that the federal government must provide, but the plan also imposes a remarkable number of new and costly requirements on every federal agency.

In addition, the Department of Justice has announced plans to develop translations of documents into 30 languages. Now, the Department of Transportation believes that traffic signs in English are problematic. Mr. Speaker, we must stop this tremendous cost burden on the United States taxpayer.

Today, I join several colleagues in introducing legislation to rescind Executive Order 13166. Rescinding this burdensome executive order will not only alleviate a costly mandate on federal agencies, but also protect our great nation from further language barriers.

Implementing Executive Order 13166 will only reinforce language barriers in the United States. Rather than discourage people from learning English and enjoying the benefits associated with English proficiency, the United States should encourage all individuals united by one government to join in a single language. Executive Order 13166 does not encourage those seeking benefits from developing English proficiency.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the repeal of Executive Order 13166.

RECIPIENT OF THE DAILY POINTS
OF LIGHT AWARDS, NETTIE REYNOLDS

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 2001

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this moment to recognize Nettie Reynolds of Gypsum, Colorado, The Points of Light Foundation recipient of The Daily Points of Light Award. The Daily Points of Light Award honors an individual or organization that makes a positive and lasting difference in the lives of others. The award is a fitting tribute to a woman who has given of herself immeasurably during the course of her distinguished life.

For more than 30 years, Nettie Reynolds has volunteered to serve her community. She first served her community as a teen member of the Civil Defense League. Then, in 1969, she organized the town of Gypsum's Ladies' Volunteer Fire Department, where she held

3325

the position of Fire Chief until she retired in 1997. She also managed and ran emergency medical calls with the Western Eagle County Ambulance District for many years. In addition, Nettie has been active in health care organizations and various other emergency medical service agencies. And in her "spare time" Nettie still finds time to visit with seniors and disabled citizens, giving them affection and making them feel loved.

Mr. Speaker, Nettie Reynolds is a role model that people of all ages can and should look up to. It is obvious why Nettie Reynolds was chosen as The Points of Light Award recipient, I think that we all owe her a debt of gratitude for her service and dedication to the community.

Nettie, your community, state and nation are proud of you and grateful for your service.

RECOGNIZING INTERNATIONAL
WOMEN'S DAY

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 2001

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I am proud today to introduce a resolution recognizing and supporting the goals of International Women's Day. Women in the United States organized the first Women's Day in 1908 and helped inspire the International movement. International Women's Day celebrated on March 8th, began as a movement for voting rights and labor rights. Over the years, it has grown, and today, it is seen as a day for asserting women's political, economic, and social rights, for reviewing the progress that women have made, as a day for celebration, and as a day for demonstration.

In the early 1900's, the solidarity of women working on suffrage and improved labor conditions led to the formation of the first women's labor union, the Women's Trade Union League. Almost a century later, we have much to celebrate, yet we also have much work left to do to advance the status of women worldwide.

Women all over the world are contributing to the growth of economies, participating in the world of diplomacy and politics, and improving the quality of lives of their families, communities, and nations. And we should honor the women who have led us this far. Women like, Jane Addams, Coretta Scott King, Gloria Anzaldua, Maya Lin, Aung San Suu Kyi from Burma (now Myanmar), the Mirabel sisters from the Dominican Republic, Shabana Azmi from India, Rigoberta Menchu from Guatemala, Eleanor Roosevelt, Oprah Winfrey, Eve Ensler, Dorothy Cotton, Wangari Maathai from Kenya, and Fatou Sow from Senegal. Women around the globe, from the Americas, Africa, the Middle East, Asia, South Asia, and Europe have all contributed enormously to the struggle for gender equality and the advancement of women.

We must continue the struggle. While the right to vote has been won here in the United States, there still remain women in many countries fighting for their voices to be heard and for representation in their political process. Furthermore, women still earn less, own